order to devise a system of instruction by which they might obtain that high state of activity and perfection to which they are continually appealed. If the organ of form is to be cultivated, it must be exercised in accordance with the rules of perspective upon natural forms, because natural forms and natural faculties are in harmony with each other, each being made for each. This must be admitted by every one, and simple enough it is; nevertheless, how often are natural forms made to give place to all sorts of artificial forms in artistic instruction. The physician and surgeon investigate the structure of man and animals, the botanist does the same in the botanical kingdom, the geologist is ever searching through the depths of the earth, the chymist analyses, in order to discover the different properties of the works of creation, the astronomer explores the heavens, &c. But the student in art has not such scientific instructors. The commencement of artistic instruction in the human figure, landscape, marine, and architecture, is made up from drawings and prints, which may be good, bad, or indifferent representations of the objects proposed for imitation; and though the objects themselves might not be the most proper or convenient to place before the pupils at the commencement of their instruction, yet the most accurate representations, either in models or drawings, should be selected for the lessons, that the pupils may not imbibe false forms, meritricious execution, whims, fancies, and conceits, which may be part and parcel of the mind of the instructor, and, therefore, as such, would be produced in his lessons as most fit and proper for imitation. Such lessons, however skilfully executed, would be sure to cause great mischief in the mind of the learner, for though they might contain much ingenuity, yet but little truth might be in them, when the peculiar turn of mind of the pupil would be diverted out of its own channel by being obliged to learn the artificialities of a very different turn of mind, causing great pain in his mental powers while subjected to such errors and confusion. Elementary instruction should be truth itself, that a true foundation be laid in the youthful mind, on which all that is noble may be based. From such a foundation every excellence may be expected, and that which is most important, the original mental arrangement will be preserved and perfected. Originality of thought in either department of the sister arts, the result of an unsophisticated and an inventive mind, is lauded by the great and good, and upheld as a model of perfection; so highly and so deservedly is original thinking and invention valued. Such great lights unfortunately but seldom appear; no doubt in numerous instances from the incongruous elements with which brilliant minds have been fed. The nature of the human mind should be well investigated, and when thoroughly understood, all instruction should be adapted to it accordingly. The subject in itself is simple enough, for truth is the watchword and guide; but if this polar star is lost sight of, it will be vain to steer for its place of destination, perfection-haven; she must then either resign herself to the fate of the elements, or run herself into the first harbour of refuge that presents itself. Let truth then be the cry, and all will be right. Nothing short of a radical cure of the evil wherever it may be should be received. A radical cure of a disease is prayed for by every sufferer; and so should a radical cure be required in all unsound instruction, for a greater evil there cannot be than the perversion of the human mind. It matters not what part of the human mind is turned out of its due course by wrong instructions. The evil is equally great, and should be eradicated without delay, that its contaminating influence may penetrate no further. The rising generation require a new beginning, one that is entirely free of the old worn-out, thread-bare, patch-work, having nature for its foundation, that the truth may be received, and stored up in the mind as the only materials that should be used in inventive art. The branch of art matters not, the principle is the same; for whether it be painting, sculpture, or architecture, the student's mind must be exercised in the boundless field of nature, whose inexhaustible store will always supply the student with the true materials that he may require for effecting his designs. An artist in historical or landscape painting succeeds in proportion as he collects his studies from nature. If he depends upon antique statues for the forms of his figures, and old pictures for arrangements of colour and light and shadow, he will ascend no higher in the scale of intellect than a mere copyist of other's art, instead of aspiring to the high calling of an inventor and designer. If a sculptor imbues his mind with the forms of Greek and Roman sculpture, because he fancies they are more beautiful than the human forms he has seen in nature, he must also rest satisfied with the name of a copyist. Michael Angelo Donatello, Beccafumi, and other great sculptors did not stoop to the works of others, but studied mankind as the fountain head from which the knowledge of human form flows. If the architect places himself before the Greek and Roman temples, and settles the matter in his own mind that they are perfection, and, therefore, copies those buildings to help him in his designs for Christian houses of prayer, palaces, mansions, dwelling-houses, club-houses, gin palaces, villas, cottages, &c.; he must expect to fail in design and invention. For however perfect were the Greek temples for the time and pagan purposes for which they were erected, they must of necessity be the most imperfect for Christian worship and for the convenience and domestic comforts of the people of 2,000 years afterwards. This point alone should satisfy architects, that as Greek architecture reflects the highest credit on its designers, they should do as the Greek architects did,—they studied how to produce what was required in their own days, and not what others required 2,000 years before them.

The exhibitions of modern pictures sufficiently shew by their great talent the truth of these remarks, as a great majority of the subjects have come under the artist's observations, and those which belong to far by-gone-days are the result of accurate study from similar objects in nature, made by correct thinking to represent the beings and things which are part and parcel of the subject. This is the true course for a student to pursue, if he wishes to become an artist in painting, sculpture, or architecture. Students must no longer deceive themselves in either of the sister arts: in the one of painting there is not much danger; but in sculpture and architecture there is much yet to be done. The students in these arts are very inadequately trained and most defectively taught. The painter is in the right path, and only requires to know how he may arrive at the end of it. When a more enlarged course of instruction is produced for his tuition, then works of high art will be the result at his hands: the major part of such a system of instruction must be embraced by the sculptors and architects also, if they aspire to works of high art. And though, as we have said before, that division of labour will be; nevertheless, the painter, the sculptor, and the architect should have a common understanding in each other's art, otherwise, to a certain extent, they must be defective in their own art. The sculptor should study the beings and objects as much as the painter, only with this difference —using his own tools, though he should not be sparing with the pencil, chalk, and brush, that he may collect action and expression the more readily, which is ever before him. He should never be without a sketch-book and pencil, that he may be always ready to collect such materials which will furnish him with ideas, and facilitate him in his execution. Also, he should have a correct understanding of architecture, that he may compose, arrange, and design more perfectly his own works to accord with the situation in which his sculpture is to be placed. The architect must act in the same manner; he must study from nature, if he expects to be a designer in architecture. Nature will supply him with the materials for his art.

It may be said that clouds, mountains, hills, woods, vallies, rivers, &c., will not furnish the architect with forms for his buildings: this is a point not to be settled so quickly. Nature is the fountain head of all knowledge, she furnishes the historical, the landscape, the marine, the flower and the architectural painter, with the materials for his art. Buildings and sculpture are made up of natural materials; so far those parts of nature must be studied by architects and sculptors. But the sculptor's art is to represent man and animals, foliage and flowers, as well as artificial forms, drapery, architecture, &c., all of which should be most accurately studied by him if he intends to produce faithful representations. He must as a designer become well acquainted with the nature of man. He should have a thorough understanding of the human mind in order to represent that action and expression which would embody the leading characteristics and peculiarities of mind of the beings who are to be handed down to posterity by sculptured art. Sculptors of late have not been sufficiently educated as artists. They have not been directed to nature to collect their materials for effecting their designs. They have been taught to imitate the antique, and to regard the Greek statues as perfection, until at last they are so strongly imbued with the Greek forms and attitudes, that they cannot help infusing the peculiar beauties of the Greek sculpture into their own works, turning English ladies and gentlemen into Greek gods and goddesses, losing the individuality and mind of the persons, and consequently the deep interest which the relatives, the friends, and the public would feel if they had faithful representations to regard.

The late highly talented sculptor, Mr. Flaxman, stated to me that he felt the defects of his education to be an insurmountable bar to his improvement as a designer. He considered the system of artistic instruction under which he studied to be very injurious to an artistic mind; it laid an artificial foundation, and therefore arrested invention; a loss which no artist ought to sustain. On all occasions he felt himself under Greek trammels, so much so, that when interesting groups of people presented themselves to him, he could not help giving while sketching them a Greek statue-like character; one he made like a Hercules, another like the Apollo, a third like an Antinous, a fourth like the Venus, and so on; each person resembling statues instead of living beings, giving the thousanth edition of pagan gods and goddesses, for the ever new and highly interesting action and expression of the people who were continually assembling in groups as business and accidental matters brought them together. This artificial quality of mind, which was inculcated in him at his early education he deplored greatly, and wished much to eradicate, but he could not accomplish it. As great as Mr. Flaxman was, he failed in the representation of natural action and expression, producing a fixed and stone-like appearance, instead of the motion of life, of flesh and blood. We will now say a few words on architecture.

Should an architect be an artist or not, or should an architect make himself acquainted with the different branches of the arts, in order to perfect himself as an architect? Will a study of the works of creation enlarge the architect's mind in architectural design and construction, or should an architect rest satisfied with his present amount of geometrical and building knowledge, and conclude that it is not necessary for his faculties for the arts of design to be legitimately exercised? Is this satisfactorily established? Do the results prove the truth of this point, or do the modern architectural designs express their object. For instance, do the modern buildings express in their architectural forms, divisions, and arrangements, the purpose for which they were erected? Does Buckingham Palace express by its architecture a palace for an English sovereign, or do the architectural forms, divisions, and arrangements signify English design, or Greek, Italian, and Roman? Do the different club houses express in their designs, the object for which they were designed—English refreshment houses of these days? Do the street houses express what they were built for? Do many of the modern mansions in the country inhabited by the upper classes, express English mansions of the present time? Does the Bank of England express in its architecture its particular purport? Do its empty niches remind us of the different governors and directors of that great monied establishment, and that the Greek, Roman, and Italian architecture with which it is composed express truly an English bank? Does the Royal Exchange express in its classic portico a London building of exchange? Do St. Martin's church, St. George's Bloomsbury, and the like, express, by their Roman architecture, and which was originally designed for Pagan worship, a Protestant place of worship? Does the National Gallery express its name? Even in this gallery of art, the designer appears not

To learn how to use OCR and PDF-Compression visit ThePaperlessOffice.org